

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

June 18, 2003
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair	Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair	Rusty Gant, ADOT
Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona	Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee	Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert	Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
Jed S. Billings, FNF Construction	Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors
Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix	*Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
Mayor James Cavanaugh, Goodyear	#Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
* Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria	Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale	Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

#Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano at 4:07 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Giuliano announced that transit tickets were available for those who used transit to come to the meeting. Validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage. Chairman Giuliano requested that conversations be kept to a minimum during the meeting to ensure that the meeting could be heard.

Chairman Giuliano stated that Marty Shultz was participating via telephone conference call. He requested that members have their microphones turned on while speaking so Mr. Shultz could hear discussion.

Chairman Giuliano introduced and welcomed new TPC member James Cavanaugh, Mayor of Goodyear.

Chairman Giuliano stated that a revised summary transmittal for agenda item #4B, reflecting action taken by the Executive Committee, the public input opportunity report for agenda item #5, along with materials submitted by various organizations, were at each place.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Giuliano stated that an opportunity is available to members of the public to offer public comment. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from DD Barker, who stated that she had attended the meeting by bus and appreciated receiving the transit tickets. She hoped that the tickets were available from staff because she was at a meeting and they were not available. Ms. Barker mentioned that she was on four buses that day, and even though it has been reported otherwise, the air conditioning on the buses she rode that day from Tempe to Phoenix was cold. She expressed congratulations to the City of Tempe for the accommodations they have provided at their transit stops that include covers, bike racks, and a posted bus schedule. Ms. Barker stated that multimodal feels good. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Blue Crowley, who stated that it is the rule in the desert, if you are thirsty, it is already too late. When it comes to transportation, we are more than thirsty, we are without a canteen at times. Mr. Crowley stated that Scenario C, the most transit-oriented, is lacking, because in 20 years, there is still no bus service along 51st Avenue or to the reservations. He stated that he wants the capital split freeways and light rail one part, and bike, bus and pedestrian, with an emphasis from both to streets. Mr. Crowley stated that Lindy Bauer had handed out an air quality map. He noted there were only three violations last year, but all monitors will have something going on this year. Mr. Crowley stated that he keeps hearing that the business community does not want to cover operations, but everything in construction is causing some pollution. You are supposed to be doing HOV when you add SOV lanes. When doing upgrades, he was told that bike would be a part. Mr. Crowley urged using paint as a weapon for the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians. If drivers do not see a painted crosswalk, they feel there is not a crosswalk. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Rich Nolan, immediate past chair of the Tempe Transit Commission, which by ordinance provides input on transportation issues to the City Council and oversight of the 1996 Tempe transportation plan. He stated that Tempe voters have consistently supported regional and local transportation ballot propositions, especially when there has been an extensive public input process. He stated that he had handed out a memorandum of the Commission's recommendations. The memorandum was made a part of the permanent record. In summary, the Commission recommends a split of the sales tax extension of 50 percent for bus, rail, bike, and pedestrian projects and 50 percent for freeways and street projects. He noted that these recommendations are consistent with the City of Tempe General Plan and the results of the MAG Town Hall, and in line with the goals of regional voters as expressed in the MAG polling process. Mr. Nolan stated that as a region, there is a need to recognize different solutions and priorities for different parts of the Valley to ensure funding. Mr. Nolan stated that the Commission supports reimbursement of operations and maintenance for transit in the same manner as freeway costs. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Nolan for his comments and memorandum.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Giuliano stated that agenda items #4A and #4B were on the consent agenda.

Chairman Giuliano stated that any member of the committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually.

Mayor Thomas asked why agenda item #4B was being considered by the TPC. Mr. Smith explained that when the responsibilities for the TPC were approved, TIP amendments were defined as a responsibility.

Councilmember Bilsten moved to recommend approval of the consent agenda. Mayor Thomas seconded.

Before a vote was taken, Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who commented on left turn signals. He noted that the public input section on the summary transmittal says no specific comment was received; however, he had attempted to provide comment on the TIP amendment item at the TRC meeting but was denied. Mr. Crowley stated that he wanted the record to reflect that. He commented on the cost for the multipurpose underpass at I-17 and Maryland and overpass at 43rd Avenue and Peoria. Mr. Crowley stated that an underpass at Grand Avenue/Grand Canal/I-17 is needed, and also one on Grand continuing along the canal. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

The vote taken on the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of May 21, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the May 21, 2003 meeting minutes.

4B. Federal Fiscal Year 2003 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout and Amendment/Adjustments to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and FY 2003 and FY 2004 Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approving the interim closeout of Federal FY 2003, as recommended by the Transportation Review Committee at its May 29, 2003, meeting as follows: (1) Defer the projects listed in Table One; (2) Add new projects, or advance from a future year, or allocate additional funds to, the projects listed in Table Two; (3) Amend the FY 2003 and FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets to include the additional funds for the Bicycle Education Workshop, the Pedestrian Design Program, the Williams Gateway Airport Freeway - Corridor Study and the Evaluation of ITS Applications for Elderly Mobility as shown in Table Three; and (4) Authorize an amendment/administrative adjustment to the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to include the necessary projects in FY 2003. In this phase of the closeout process, approximately \$13.4 million is available for the close out. Approximately \$29.6 million in project requests have been received for the funds available. On May 29, 2003, the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) recommended approval of the deferral of the 15 projects requested and recommended projects to utilize the majority of the funds available. Further action is expected next month on contingency projects to utilize any further funds that might become available

during the final close out phase. On the June 11, 2003, the Management Committee recommended approval. On June 16, 2003, the Executive Committee recommended approval.

5. Public Involvement Update and Discussion of Timing for Next Survey

Theresa Gunn, Gunn Communications, gave a presentation summarizing recent public outreach and the results of five public workshops. She stated that the purpose of the public outreach is to provide early input into the Regional Transportation Plan process, determine the funding priorities of the general public, and to present these priorities to the TPC. Ms. Gunn stated that three survey instruments were used and included a telephone poll, a funding priorities survey, and a four-question survey. Ms. Gunn addressed the results from the funding priorities survey that showed support for new freeways, but at lower funding levels; support for improving the existing system; minimal support for HOV lanes; and strong support for freeway maintenance. She summarized the transit funding findings. She noted that support was strong for commuter rail, with respondents allocating more than allowed for this mode. Ms. Gunn reviewed the priorities by community organizations that included Valley Citizens League, Glendale Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee, Phoenix Surface Transportation Advisory Committee, environmental leaders, and Sun City Grand neighborhood representatives. She provided a breakdown of the preferences by geographic area. Ms. Gunn noted that all results indicated a preference for a multimodal system.

Kelly Taft continued the presentation on additional public involvement special events that included freeway openings, MAG at the Mall, MAG Regional Town Hall, Sunday on Central, and presentations to Title VI communities and numerous groups. Ms. Taft provided a review of the results of the four-question survey. Question One: What is the single most important thing that can be done to improve the Valley's transportation system? Ms. Taft stated that the combined results from 12 categories showed bus service as the number one answer, followed by freeways and rail. Question Two: If it was your job to decide how to distribute our tax dollars on transportation improvements and you had a total of \$100 of tax money to distribute, how would you distribute it among the following four areas—freeways, bus service, light rail, and streets and roads? Ms. Taft stated that the responses showed an almost equal distribution among the modes, which shows a preference for a multimodal plan. Question Three: In 1985, Valley voters passed Proposition 300, a 20-year, one half cent sales tax to improve the transportation system in Maricopa County. Were you aware or unaware that this tax would expire in 2005? Ms. Taft noted that 60 percent of respondents were unaware of this. Question Four: From what you have read, seen, or heard, would you say the funds provided from Proposition 300 have had a major impact, a minor impact or no impact on improving the transportation system in Maricopa County? Ms. Taft stated that highest response was that the tax had a major impact. She noted that Mr. Shultz had written an editorial in *The Arizona Republic* that summed up that the public understands the need for a mix of transportation improvements. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Gunn and Ms. Taft for their presentations.

Chairman Giuliano noted consensus that the second public survey would be conducted after a firmer draft plan was developed based on input from the TPC.

6. Development of the Hybrid Scenario

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from David Martin, who represents Maricopa 2020, and who is President of the Arizona Chapter of Associated General Contractors. Mr. Martin expressed thanks to Dennis Smith and Eric Anderson for their hard work on the hybrid plan. He wanted to let the

TPC know that Mr. Smith and Mr. Anderson work to get all to reach consensus and he appreciated the efforts on this complicated issue. Mr. Martin handed out a memorandum of the issues and concerns Maricopa 2020 has with the hybrid scenario. The memorandum was entered into the permanent record. Mr. Martin stated that currently, there is a \$1.3 billion deficit based on revenue and what MAG has proposed in the hybrid scenario. He stated that the group remains firmly flexible in moving forward, with the understanding that these are not policy statements, just a realization that there needs to be a multimodal plan. Mr. Martin stated that Maricopa 2020 suggests the following to reduce the budget deficit: 1) Replace the I-10 reliever with a parkway. Depending on right of way costs, this could save nearly \$700 million. 2) Allocate more money for I-17 improvements, because \$500 million is insufficient to create any significant improvements to the freeway. He noted that I-17 is integral to a credible plan that will be presented to voters. 3) Reduce the \$1.735 billion transit operations budget by decreasing the grid and/or increasing local match. 4) Cut the arterial street program by \$500 million. 5) Cut the light rail transit component of RARF money for 20 additional miles. Mr. Martin stated that Maricopa 2020 also suggests that the TPC consider options for connecting the South Mountain to I-10, include SR 85, as a part of Canamex; and consider maintenance and operations funding coming from an alternate source, such as an additional tax. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Martin for his comments and memorandum.

Mayor Thomas noted that in the presentation on public input there was a recurring theme to include light rail and commuter transit, yet Mr. Martin spoke about eliminating them entirely. Mr. Martin replied that Maricopa 2020 thinks that in the campaign, you could show funding for these modes with the aggregate amount of revenue.

Mr. Almanza asked about input received, especially in regard to light rail. Mr. Martin replied that the Maricopa 2020 coalition includes Greater Phoenix Leadership, Greater Phoenix Convention and Visitors Bureau, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, Arizona Rock Products, Arizona Subcontractors Association, Association of General Contractors, Arizona Chamber of Commerce, Arizona Association of Industries, Utility Transportation Contractors Association, Westmarc, East Valley Partnership, East Valley Chamber Alliance, Central Arizona Homebuilders Association, APS, Southwest Gas, Phoenix Community Alliance, American Council of Engineering, and the Arizona Contractors Association.

Mr. Almanza stated that he belongs to a number of the groups Mr. Martin mentioned, and he was unaware that a position had been taken to not support light rail. He added that he had just discussed this with a member of one of the groups, and that person specifically indicated that was not their position. Mr. Martin clarified that his statements were not policy statements, but statements in regard to the \$1.3 billion deficit. He added that Maricopa 2020 had gone on the record as supporting a multimodal solution that includes light rail and transit capital. Mr. Almanza stated that the way the comments were phrased indicated these groups supported the recommendations outlined in the memorandum. Mr. Martin noted that all members of the aforementioned groups are welcome to attend the regular meetings where the policy positions are made.

Councilmember Bilsten clarified that this is not the position of the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce and the Phoenix Community Alliance. She added that they absolutely support mass transit. Mr. Martin stated that there are dynamics and they understand some coalition members may have an agenda and accept that as part of the democratic process.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that she and Mayor Drake recently attended a Westmarc Executive Committee meeting. At the meeting, the need for an I-10 reliever with full funding was discussed.

Direction on this was given to the Westmarc Executive Director. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that Maricopa 2020's recommendation is out of compliance with the Westmarc Executive Committee position.

Mr. Shultz stated that Maricopa 2020 supports light rail and transit. He noted that they are trying to get a better understanding of the revenue shortfall. Mr. Shultz asked Mr. Martin if they were raising this as an issue or was it a hard position. Mr. Martin stated that the coalition was raising it as an issue that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Shultz stated that this will be balancing off the equity and modal splits need to be determined. That is what this exercise is about. Mr. Shultz stated that there will be a rail and transit component committed by the TPC.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Bill Lazenby, Vice President of the Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists, a volunteer statewide advocacy organization. Mr. Lazenby requested that a higher emphasis be placed on bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Mr. Lazenby commented that representatives from his organizations attended all of the public meetings, and what he heard was that it is too dangerous to ride a bike on streets. He stated that education and better facilities are needed. Mr. Lazenby stated that his group wants it safer for bicyclists and pedestrians. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Lazenby for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who stated that he had a problem that funding for current transportation operations and maintenance is not being addressed as it should be. At the current pricing, the total amount will be \$225 million if costs stay the same. If the costs are tied to inflation, that is a 300 percent increase over the past 20 years. Mr. Crowley stated that he needed the maintenance cost, without building new miles, and pedestrian and bike to be addressed. He stated that he needed paint to be used as a weapon. Mr. Crowley stated that there are no buses to the reservation on 51st Avenue, which has been there for a long time. He stated that he did not see the plan getting to the West Valley, where the growth is going. Mr. Crowley stated that nothing is taking care of future development. He stated that he wanted light rail and freeway together as one part, transit operations and maintenance together as another part, and the other part would be streets, bike, and pedestrian. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Giuliano stated that at the May 21, 2003 meeting, the TPC authorized staff to proceed with the development of a hybrid scenario based on the findings of the modeling analysis and other input received from stakeholders on the three draft scenarios. He noted that at the July 2nd and July 16th meetings, the hybrid will be developed for public comment, and the time frame is significant. We know if we do the current hybrid plan, we will be \$1.3 billion short. Everyone has their own solutions, but all have to realize the shortfall needs to be fixed collectively. Upon discussion with stakeholders, he indicated that he remained convinced that the TPC is not far off with a plan they can get behind. Tonight all need to express their thoughts so staff will know the direction of the TPC. Chairman Giuliano stated that it is coming down to decisions on percentage of roads, freeways, transit, light rail, then overlay with capital and operations and maintenance. There are three or four major distinctions that need to be made. It is important to have frank conversation tonight so staff can move forward to refine the hybrid plan. Some modes are at odds with others because of demographics, geography, or infrastructure. Chairman Giuliano stated that to the City of Tempe, needs are different. Transit is important to Tempe because the City is not going to grow much further. Chairman Giuliano asked members to show a sense of where they are coming from under review of the hybrid plan. The group

needs to discuss RARF and what it should fund, as well as bring diverse interests together. He added that this exercise is like the run on the bank in “It’s a Wonderful Life.” Everyone wants everything, but if this happened, the first in line will get everything and there will be nothing left for the rest.

Mayor Thomas asked if agenda item #7 should be considered before agenda item #6, because discussion of operations and maintenance could have an impact on decision making for agenda item #7. Mr. Smith replied that agenda item #7 was an update, because the work of the Maintenance Stakeholders is unfinished, and they are currently working on a Resolution. He noted that some information on maintenance was included in the presentation on the hybrid.

Supervisor Stapley mentioned that a report on the comments on the transportation plan scenarios approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 16th was recently distributed, and a copy was at each place. The report was entered into the permanent record. He acknowledged the attendance of Supervisor Max W. Wilson, Regional Council representative, at the meeting. Supervisor Stapley commented that it appears there is some misunderstanding about light rail and the use of RARF funds. He asked if the half cent sales tax was vital to the success of the light rail programs in those cities that have approved light rail? Supervisor Stapley noted that Tempe, Phoenix, and Glendale have voted for light rail, but the rest of the communities have not. He added that he is not personally opposed to light rail, but wanted clarification. If there is no sales tax allocated to light rail, could those cities build their systems? Supervisor Stapley noted that the 1985 tax focused on capital costs.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that the City of Phoenix is prepared to move forward on its light rail segment. She commented that polls have been taken, and all four say light rail has got to be a part. Councilmember Bilsten stated that this is not saying that the plan needs to be all freeway or all transit. She stated that every community should have the ability to put forward what their voters will support. As far as the half cent, who is going to fund it? Phoenix, Tempe, and Glendale have a large number of voters. Councilmember Bilsten stated that after polling and numerous meetings, responses have indicated a desire for a multimodal approach. Times have changed since 1985. All communities have grown, needs have grown. Councilmember Bilsten stated that it is clear there needs to be a multimodal approach that reflects the needs of the communities.

Supervisor Stapley stated that he was not opposed to light rail, but felt it was not the right approach to take funding out of the RARF for a light rail component. The question is, can cities build their light rail systems without the half cent sales tax being a component?

Councilmember Bilsten asked why voters in Phoenix, Glendale, or Tempe would say yes to the extension when the improvements would be going outside their communities?

Supervisor Stapley stated he differed with Councilmember Bilsten’s conclusion. There are huge amounts of money going to transit, whether express or regional bus routes, not necessarily light rail. Supervisor Stapley advised that MAG’s own survey says BRT/express bus is 1.7 times more cost effective than light rail.

Eric Anderson clarified that it is important to put specific transportation investments in the context of the areas they will serve. Freeway is higher capacity than light rail, but in many places in the region, additional freeway capacity to address the demand can no longer be accommodated. Mr. Anderson stated that light rail provides a mobility option even on arterial streets, which will also become more congested. He advised that travel on light rail will be superior to arterials. Mr. Anderson stated that

growth needs to be projected and considered. In 1985, it was important to have a core freeway system in place. However, all of the recent surveys and public input opportunities came to the conclusion that citizens realize the value of beefed up transit and the importance of light rail.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that one light rail car can carry the capacity as the entire SR 51 as we know it today. Therefore, we know that mode actually moves as much capacity as SR 51 at peak times.

Supervisor Stapley stated that his point is light rail versus other modes of transit other than freeway. He suggested spending the minimal amount of money we have on the most cost effective system, and that is not light rail.

Chairman Giuliano stated that in response to Supervisor Stapley's question, yes, they do need RARF, because it is a capacity issue. Where light rail is being implemented, it is not for people who live within Tempe, but for those who need to come to Tempe.

Supervisor Stapley asked what it would take to not disrupt building light rail systems so we can spend as much cost effectively as we can on other modes, not just light rail? He commented that, with all due respect to the surveys, too much for light rail and this vote will go down.

Mr. Anderson clarified that BRT/Express buses on arterials will not have more capacity than light rail and will likely not be as cost effective as light rail in the long term. BRT/Express has a much higher operating cost and will suffer from the same travel speed declines we see on arterials. Unless you go to a fixed busway system, in which case, the cost of fixed BRT in its own busway is approaching the cost of light rail.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that her city is not depending on the half cent sales tax fund, and her city had figured in the cost. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the vote should be allocated to capital expenditure and light rail, including the 20 mile starter route, because we are supposed to be developing a regional system. The majority have said we want light rail to be a component of a multimodal system. To deliver a regional system we should go beyond the initial 20-mile starter segment. Vice Chair Scruggs explained that the rules at Valley Metro Rail are if you want to bring light rail to other cities, those cities will have a huge buy-in cost. Valley Metro Rail is the bank for the rest of the Valley that might ever want to have light rail. As new communities come in they must pay back the bank a portion of the cost for the facilities they will need to use. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that by moving these capital costs into the half cent sales tax, no one has to be the bank. She added that these facilities are needed to have a regional light rail system. We can encourage light rail as a true regional system by not making cities have to buy in. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that communities would pay operating costs. She emphasized that she does not favor this so her community can save money, but to make light rail a regional system. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that if the voters in Phoenix, Glendale, Mesa and Tempe are added up, that would probably be a majority. Think of it as a true investment if you want to create a truly regional system. Vice Chair Scruggs indicated that her support is falling away from other uses.

Mayor Manross stated that her city is not in the program yet, but if they want to be, there cannot be a disincentive for starting up light rail. If there is a disincentive, cities will not increase their systems and no others will ever buy in. Therefore, the system will never truly be regional. She commented on the need to go for the long term. Mayor Manross expressed that she understood the County Board's position, but the bottom line is we need a lot of money for transportation. If we do not get a majority of voters supporting the plan, we will have nothing. Mayor Manross stated that communities know their

constituents, and the surveys are pretty clear that our communities want true multimodal enhanced transit, and more freeways. Light rail is a part. If we ignore the communities' wants, with an afterthought to transit, we will fail, because Scottsdale, Phoenix, Tempe, Mesa and Glendale voters will not support the election and then we will have nothing. Mayor Manross stated that Scottsdale realizes they will not get every cent back, but always has been a team player.

Mr. Shultz asked Vice Chair Scruggs for clarification if she supported RARF capital investments at a minimum to include BRT, transit, light rail, arterials, and freeways. Vice Chair Scruggs replied that her comments spoke only to light rail. She explained that what would qualify for RARF would be those major capital costs for light rail facilities because as each community comes in, that community would have to pay for use of those facilities. If capital facilities are covered, we will have the regional system faster.

Mr. Shultz commented on the June 11th concept. He stated that it appeared the TPC has come to grips that capital investment must include light rail. Consistent with that, transit and BRT capital must be part of the RARF. Then other capital investments would be freeway. Mr. Shultz stated that the next step would be to determine specific investments and what is needed for maintenance, not operations.

Chairman Giuliano stated that around the country is a growing understanding that capital and operations/maintenance should be capital/maintenance and operations.

Gary Kaasa, Kaasa, Cantelme & Associates, addressed Supervisor Stapley's comments. He stated that he was involved in the Phoenix and Glendale transportation sales tax elections. He stated that he felt comfortable saying that Phoenix voters want light rail, as shown by the largest victory in a transit election in the United States, with Glendale not far behind. Mr. Kaasa stated that the ballot showed routes, and acknowledged that not all routes would be funded. He added that people were told that other sources would be sought to build them, and he was not surprised that they are seeking these other funds through the half cent sales tax.

Mayor Dunn stated that his city currently has 210,000 citizens, a number that is expected to increase to 300,000 at buildout in three to five years. Their city has freeways and that phase is now done. Mayor Dunn expressed support for the HOV concept on Loops 101 and 202, but views that as a transit component. He indicated that his citizens would want more than an HOV. Mayor Dunn stated that Chandler adopted impact fees for arterial streets. Therefore, arterials would not be a major impact because the city has other sources for funding them. He stated that it comes down to mass rapid transit of some sort in Chandler. Mayor Dunn stated that rapid buses are an issue for the Chandler community, and they consider light rail as a future option.

Mayor Manross stated her agreement with Mayor Dunn. There needs to be an incentive to encourage light rail or BRT, whichever is appropriate. Transit must be significant in the plan. Mayor Manross stated that we would be totally unrealistic if we do not understand that light rail is capital intensive and transit is operations intensive. She added that there is no Holy Grail to say these dollars cannot fund transit system operations. Mayor Manross stated that operations must be considered to be successful.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that there is the expectation of a great amount of BRT in a very short amount of time and those expectations will not be fulfilled. As revenue begins to be collected, there will be choices that need to be made. Anything that will require operating costs will need a funding stream

in place. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that there will be great competition for allocations. There needs to be some idea of the timing before putting support one way or the other.

Mr. Smith stated that in 1994, we had a blank slate, but the election lost. Then Tempe, Phoenix, and Glendale had transit elections. He stated that RPTA has been tasked with coming up with a regional transit solution overlaying the plans of the three cities in different stages of development. However, one size fits all is not going to work. Mr. Smith stated that we need to piece together a solution that fits all parts of the entire Valley. Look at where communities already are. Mr. Smith stated that if a city says it needs something in particular, we need to accommodate that.

Chairman Giuliano commented that each will not get everything on every list. He mentioned that comments on the three scenarios are due on June 23rd and will be used to further develop the hybrid system.

Eric Anderson gave a presentation on the first draft hybrid scenario.

Mr. Arnett asked about the \$2.5 billion decrease in revenue. He asked if ADOT was unaware of these subprograms until just now? Mr. Anderson stated that this had been done six months ago, but staff was busy on other work. In addition, staff was waiting for 2004 adjustments to ensure having the most accurate numbers. Mr. Anderson stated that he has mentioned on a number of occasions that these numbers would go down because of allocations to subprograms. Mr. Arnett commented that it is troubling that \$2.5 billion has been taken away. Mr. Anderson stated that these are dollars spent in the region. We have a planning period of 2006-2025, and ADOT projects are fully programmed for 2006, 2007 and 2008, and they need to be included.

Mr. Anderson continued with the presentation on funding by source and mode.

Chairman Giuliano asked Mr. Anderson if anything needed to be included or deleted. Mr. Anderson replied that while developing the hybrid, money was added for the 101 and 202 interchanges.

Mayor Dunn commented on adding interchanges to existing freeways, and that he thought developers should pay some portion of the cost if the development is the primary reason the interchange was needed. Mr. Anderson stated that a 50 percent match is assumed on interchanges.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked about the amount of funding for I-17. Mr. Anderson replied that \$500 million is included for improvements to I-17. Mayor Cavanaugh asked if an increase is anticipated. Mr. Anderson replied that it is possible. Mayor Cavanaugh asked about the difficulties mentioned for improving SR 51. Mr. Anderson stated that no funding is included for that stretch of SR 51.

Mr. Kane stated that at the last TPC meeting, a 50 percent developer match was used as a model, and he understood that it was decided that the match would be performance based, rather than a designated percentage.

Mayor Hawker commented that the cost to build an interchange is inexpensive compared to the cost for adding capacity to a freeway that is impacted by a development. That cost for capacity ends up being paid by the region. Mayor Hawker stated that the cost for capacity is more of a concern to him than the cost for interchanges.

Vice Chair Scruggs addressed the 50 percent match, which works in some situations. She noted that on the 101 there is a two-mile stretch between Camelback and Glendale Avenue without an interchange. In the 1985 plan, the 101 and the Paradise Parkway interchanged at the half way mark between Camelback and Glendale Avenue. The Paradise Parkway was subsequently deleted from the regional plan by Executive Order. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the interchange is programmed by ADOT but not at full funding. She contended that full funding of this regionally significant interchange in Glendale should not require any local match. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the precedent for adding a regionally significant interchange was set on September 15, 1998, when the Regional Council agreed to add an interchange on the San Tan at Hawes Road to serve Williams Gateway Airport. At the time the conceptual design for the San Tan was being developed, the Air Force did not want an interchange, but after the base closed, a fully funded interchange was added into the regional plan. She noted that both the San Tan and the 101 interchanges serve a regional purpose. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that there may be other communities to which this could apply. She suggested that the rule should not be hard and fast. Chairman Giuliano requested that staff research these types of historical situations. Mr. Anderson noted that this is consistent with Mr. Kane's comments that some interchanges perform a regional function. Chairman Giuliano noted consensus that the full interchange on the 101 between Camelback and Glendale Ave. should be fully funded through regional funds and that regional benefit is a reasonable consideration for funding interchanges.

Mr. Anderson continued the presentation on arterial street comments. Comments received included: Need to review cost estimates; focus on regional routes; do not overlook developer contributions—do not assume the region will fund widening or new routes, and options may be available for funding. Mr. Anderson commented that the cost effectiveness of projects will be reexamined, and some routes could come off the map. Mr. Smith stated that goal is figure out how to balance and fund the \$1.3 billion deficit.

Mayor Hawker commented on having an overlay of the freeway and street maps. In the East Valley, it looks like a lot of streets, but there are only four miles of freeway. He commented that the freeway network is fairly complete, but street networks are sorely lacking. That is why Mesa prioritized requests in that manner.

Mayor Dunn stated that Chandler does not have many street improvements, but has found that intersection improvements are most cost effective. He asked if arterial intersection improvements were addressed. Mr. Anderson noted that they should have been on the list. Chairman Giuliano asked about any improvements that needed to be added or deleted. Mr. Anderson stated that the Sun Valley Parkway connection to Grand Avenue is very expensive. He stated that this is one area, in conversation with partners in the West Valley, that might come off, or there might be a combination developer-funded. Mr. Anderson stated that comments were also received on Riggs Road improvements that are already underway.

Mr. Arnett asked if Riggs Road was removed or deleted, would it be kept as a future reliever? Mr. Anderson replied that it could. He added that he received comments from Queen Creek that improvements are already being made. Mr. Anderson advised that he would check on those improvements. Those underway are the ones that need to be taken off the map.

Mr. Anderson continued with the presentation and displayed the hybrid regional transit map.

Mr. Smith stated that this map is a base map of transit and lines connecting in the East Valley, but in Phoenix there will be new routes, because Phoenix wants light rail, not bus. He added that the map could look different.

Mayor Hawker stated his support for the concept. If Phoenix has a different layout for spending its money, then it should be up to them to make that call, just as the East Valley wants to have an integrated bus network. Mayor Hawker stated he supported it and hoped to have a map. He added that this will be a different campaign—it will show a community-wide emphasis.

Mr. Anderson continued with the presentation on transit comments. 1) Transit plan needs to reflect different stages of transit services in part of the region. 2) Operations and maintenance funding for regional bus routes. 3) Light rail--funding of a share of regional facilities and additional mileage above what individual communities have committed to. Mr. Anderson stated that from comments received, needs across the region vary a lot. We need to look closely and talk to communities about what they really need. Chairman Giuliano stated that staff needed direction on these.

Supervisor Stapley stated that from a RARF perspective, maintenance and operations should be kept at the ADOT level, and should be the responsibility of the legislature to fund maintenance and operations sufficiently through HURF funds. They have not addressed the HURF issue and the ball should be thrown back in their court. Supervisor Stapley stated that the Board of Supervisors feels that maintenance and operations should not be funded from the half cent sales tax. The legislature should raise the gas tax and include an inflation factor.

Mayor Thomas stated that he would address all of his comments at once because he needed to leave for a 7:00 council meeting. He commented that in conversations with BNSF, he feels commuter rail is feasible. In the region, we build highways, then it is up to the driver to buy a car and drive on them. If we do the same with rail, we would have the opportunity for a public/private partnership with rail that could have a national model. Mayor Thomas stated that with the rail system already in place, that would be a regional system. He expressed concern with scenario C that had \$6.9 billion for regional bus, \$.94 billion for BRT, \$3.4 billion for enhanced BRT, \$2.3 billion light rail, and \$1.73 billion for commuter rail. He stated that beefing up rail as a component has been reaffirmed through surveys and conversations. Rail could address concerns in the Rittenhouse Road area.

Mayor Thomas commented on the proposed \$324 million for Williams Gateway Parkway that goes to Pinal County and stops. That amount is twice as much as the allocation for commuter rail. Mayor Thomas stated that the Parkway is neither regional nor addresses a component for which the voters have expressed support. He commented on the new and improved arterials grid that showed failed intersections. Where the Southeast Valley has improved in traffic congestion because highways are being constructed, the Northwest Valley is starting to fail. Mayor Thomas stated that it looked like the West Valley is on the short end with arterial improvements. He stated that light rail and commuter rail could be a component to address these issues because the Paradise has been removed.

Mayor Thomas stated that the Sun Valley Parkway is similar to Anthem in that developers leapfrog development and then it is up to the region to build these roads. He stated that he could not agree more with the Phoenix plan. Mayor Thomas stated that Litchfield Park does not have freeway or rail within the city. They have a bus that two or three people board each day, however, buses have a use. Mayor Thomas emphasized that those who answered the polls exceeded the 100 percent expenditure allowed

when it came to commuter rail. Use the systems already in place and build on public/private partnership. Mayor Thomas left the meeting for his City Council meeting.

Mr. Arnett commented that there was not much money allotted for commuter rail. He stated that he agreed that in the future, regional commuter rail ought to be considered. Mr. Arnett stated that he recently read an Executive Summary on commuter rail. He said that he is convinced that a public/private partnership could be forged. Mr. Arnett stated that there would have to be cooperation with railroads. He suggested including a modest amount of perhaps \$3 to \$5 million in the plan to help develop a commuter rail program that would include BNSF to Wickenburg, Union Pacific to Buckeye and to Rittenhouse Road. Build the system with a public/private partnership process, which would become an economic developer for both the East and West Valleys. Mr. Arnett stated there is a rationale for using a modest amount of funds to develop an aggressive search for public/private partnership dollars to fund a commuter rail program. He noted that there are several companies in the nation that do this kind of work.

Supervisor Stapley asked if charging for HOV use by SOV drivers had been examined? Mr. Anderson replied that this option was examined in the Value Lane Study. He stated that the concept appeared to be feasible, but the concern was tolling existing HOV lanes, i.e., I-17 or I-10, which had the effect of people paying twice. Mr. Anderson explained that the lanes were paid with federal money and we cannot charge for use of them. Mr. Anderson advised that legislation is moving through Congress that may allow tolling for federally funded HOV lanes, and we may be able to reexamine the issue in the future. He also pointed out that on some freeways, there is not much room in the median for enforcement and toll facilities. Supervisor Stapley commented that because we are building out the HOV system, we should include tolls as an option. He sees the HOV system as a vital part of BRT. He stated that we could easily convert the mentality to a payer user system. Supervisor Stapley commented that many would be glad to pay for using underutilized lanes.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that it was time for the TPC to get to a certain point and move forward. She made a motion that the transit plan needs to reflect different stages of transit services, including BRT or whatever mode a community needs, and that light rail would be a part of this policy and plan. Mayor Manross seconded.

Chairman Giuliano asked if there was discussion on the motion.

Mr. Berry asked if the motion encompassed all transit modes, and not just rubber wheeled vehicles. Councilmember Bilsten replied yes. Mr. Berry asked Vice Chair Scruggs if the motion fit in with her vision for light rail. Vice Chair Scruggs replied that it would if light rail was included as stated in the bottom two bullets, i.e., funding of share of regional facilities for the initial 20 mile segment, for additional mileage still to be defined, and no operating cost for light rail.

Councilmember Bilsten emphasized that this motion is only the beginning. She stated that the motion was made with the understanding that light rail will be a part of what we are doing and would not be taken out. The motion is to set the bar so that light rail is no longer in question.

Mr. Berry stated that was a good idea to pull this into sharper focus, because once that is accomplished it leads to the next question of how much money. He asked for clarification if there was a caveat in the motion that expenditures for light rail would be limited to capital, and not include operations and maintenance. Councilmember Bilsten stated that was not part of the motion. That is not to say we will

not go there. Councilmember Bilsten stated that once we get the first part done, it becomes easier to have that discussion. Mr. Berry stated that the motion moves the TPC one step closer to resolution. He state that capital versus operations and maintenance is an important issue still to be decided.

Mayor Dunn stated that bullet number one was an important concept and a major step forward, but was concerned about going to bullet number two just yet.

Mayor Manross stated her agreement.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Councilmember Bilsten if her motion did not define operations and maintenance or capital costs. Councilmember Bilsten replied that was correct.

Mr. Gant asked if capital would include the 20-mile light rail starter segment and additional miles. Councilmember Bilsten stated that would be for discussion.

Mr. Smith repeated the motion for clarification. That the transit plan reflect different stages of development, including light rail and BRT being a part of the plan.

Mr. Berry asked for clarification that the motion included the entire pot, not just RARF. Councilmember Bilsten replied her motion addressed just the half cent sales tax, because a community might decide to allocate it differently.

Supervisor Stapley stated that he would have to vote no, not that he is opposed to light rail, but that it is inappropriate to allocate half cent sales tax money for light rail. He stated that he had a hunch that come the November election, there will be a different voter. Supervisor Stapley stated that November elections pull a 40 to 60 percent turnout, as opposed to special transportation elections that pull 10 to 15 percent. If you have light rail as part of the RARF, that would be a big mistake.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the focus was a May 18, 2004 election, not a November election.

Supervisor Stapley commented that as a result of conversations with legislators, he did not think that a May election will happen, no matter how hard we try.

The vote taken on the question passed, with Supervisor Stapley voting no.

Mr. Berry asked if the motion gave staff better direction or was more refinement to the plan needed? Mr. Anderson stated that bullet number two was very important. The track the TPC is on now is that regional bus service would be eligible for operations and maintenance funding in the plan. Chairman Giuliano stated that the issue of including operations and maintenance for bus for regional routes would be discussed.

Mr. Shultz stated that a clarification was needed between operations and maintenance. This discussion so far includes a broad definition. Mr. Shultz stated that subsidized operations means very little farebox, which would be unfair to the process. Mr. Anderson stated that the target for farebox revenues is approximately 20 to 30 percent of operating costs.

Mr. Berry asked the total amount of bus operations and maintenance. Mr. Anderson replied that depended on the size of the system. He noted that in the agenda packet is information that operating costs are \$1.3 billion. Mr. Smith stated that the map would most likely be changing.

Mr. Shultz stated that the amount depends on the order of magnitude of operations, because operations could literally be billions of dollars.

Jim Dickey, Valley Metro/RPTA, gave a summary of transit system costs. He stated that labor accounts for one-half or more of maintenance and operating costs; maintenance accounts for 10 to 15 percent, not including rail; insurance accounts for five to ten percent; and fuel accounts for five to ten percent.

Mr. Shultz stated that it would be nice to see pro formas if time allowed.

Mr. Billings stated that there seems to be a demand to use the service. So why is there so much deficit if that is the case? Mr. Billings asked if there is demand, could fares be increased over time to cover operations costs? He stated that the TPC had not spent much time deliberating the operations side of transit. Mr. Billings commented that the TPC is not doing the issue justice until they discuss it.

Mayor Cavanaugh commented on operations and maintenance. The TPC is trying to cut a deficit, and operations and maintenance will come out to at least 20 percent of the total. Mayor Cavanaugh stated that making a motion now places the burden for cuts on other areas. The burden for cuts should be integrated and should be borne by all modes. He stated his opposition to segregating one mode at this point.

Mr. Gant commented on operations and maintenance being discussed in the Maintenance Stakeholders process. Straight maintenance is easier to grasp, whereas operations can vary from community to community. Mr. Gant stated that he was comfortable talking about straight maintenance.

Councilmember Bilsten suggested giving direction to staff to meet with each TPC member prior to the next meeting and have a good look at maintenance and operations numbers and what maintenance and operations mean to each. To make an informed decision, the TPC needs firm numbers. Councilmember Bilsten stated that if there is an impact to the system as a whole and prevents a community from participating, that puts a flaw in the regional plan.

Chairman Giuliano asked if staff could accommodate showing the needs of individual communities as the next hybrid is developed. Mr. Anderson replied that could be accommodated. Based on TPC discussion, he thought that the numbers in the packet on transit operations were as high as they are going to be. Mr. Anderson stated that the numbers include the Phoenix bus system operations component. He added that they have indicated they will continue to be responsible for those operating costs and will put their money into light rail capital. Mr. Anderson confirmed that he was hearing the TPC members wanted a composition of these costs, how variable they are, and fuel and labor components.

Chairman Giuliano stated that one size does not fit all. You need to look at the whole, but if the pieces do not work, the whole will not work.

Mayor McDermott stated that the plan must include light rail, but was not convinced it should include the operational cost for light rail or transit maintenance. Mayor McDermott stated that if the TPC decides to cover operational costs for transit, the incentive to keep costs efficient is eliminated. He

commented that he was not comfortable with money for operations being a wise option for a good percentage of the sales tax.

Mr. Kane stated that Councilmember Bilsten's suggestion was a good idea to get further into the operations and maintenance issue. He stated that it seems when discussing the operations and maintenance of rapid transit, bus, and light rail, we get into an assumption-rich environment where we are making predictions for something that does not yet exist and we are making those estimates over 20 years. Mr. Kane stated that operations and maintenance have the most flexibility and the potential to make it much less balanced over time. As we adopt allocations, what makes us assume that the allocation we adopt will be the way the expenditure turns out over time, unless we adopt in a manner that restricts firewall allocations.

Mr. Anderson commented that operating costs experience in the region, whether arterial or bus, is well known. Light rail is a different issue because it is a new mode. Mr. Anderson stated that the TPC may want to discuss the firewall concept.

Mr. Berry commented on the maintenance and operations issue. He indicated that he was leaning toward maintenance being eligible for RARF, and would put operations low on the list. Mr. Berry stated that if RARF is used for operations, he would recommend a heavy local match or contribution. He set his priority order: capital-1, maintenance-2, operations-a distant 3, with local match.

Mayor Dunn stated his support for Councilmember Bilsten's suggestion. He stated that from his perspective, operating costs make sense for rapid bus. Mayor Dunn stated that the TPC is talking about a regional system that serves interests outside the borders. He stated that he envisioned Chandler seeking funding for a local bus system.

Mr. Arnett referred to Mr. Berry's comment about a local match. We have built a system with no dedicated maintenance funds and we need to ensure proper maintenance, whether it be freeways, buses, etc.

Mayor Manross stated that Mr. Arnett's comments were to the point. She stated that she did not understand how the TPC can deny the need for money for operations. Labor is half the cost of transit. Freeway is 93 percent capital cost. Mayor Manross stated that we need a multimodal system. If operations is not included, we cannot have a transit system. We need to have capital, but without operations, we will not have drivers to drive the bus, so won't have a system. Mayor Manross stated that in transit, it happens that the costs are weighted in operations and maintenance; in freeways, the costs are weighted in capital. Both are important needs. Mayor Manross stated that Scottsdale has had a dedicated transit tax since 1992, and will continue to have this tax. Operations and maintenance for transit has been difficult and there have been cutbacks because of budget issues. She advised that cannot do that or you have a failed system.

Councilmember Bilsten asked Mr. Smith and Mr. Anderson to come back to the TPC after meeting with each community and paint a picture of each community's needs. If a community needs something for operations and maintenance, why? If something keeps a city from being a player, the TPC needs to know that.

Mayor Hawker stated that Mesa modeled their routes to see what it would look like with a 20 percent match and they found it is a substantial amount. If the match is too high, some communities will be left

out because they cannot afford it. Some operations money needs to be included in regional bus routes to ensure viability. Mayor Hawker stated that there is then a dilemma if we say it is a 20-year tax.

Chairman Giuliano requested that staff answer at what level of operations and maintenance participation would be necessary to support the regional plan, and also address Mr. Kane's comments.

Mayor Hawker stated that the question is what are the local cities' match requirements in order to have the routes? Chairman Giuliano replied if we do not get regional operations and maintenance support, then maybe we will not do a route because it is not a part of the regional system.

Vice Chair Scruggs spoke to Mayor Hawker's comments about not doing operations and maintenance unless there is a dedicated tax. She advised that some cities have been doing this for years, in addition to their general funds.

Mr. Anderson reviewed direction to staff on developing a regional bus system: Provide distinction between operations and maintenance; talk to communities about their needs; deal with the supplanting issue. Mr. Anderson defined supplanting. If capital is regionally funded, and operations and maintenance for all existing regional routes are picked up, that will level the playing field between those that have dedicated sources, like Phoenix, and those that do not. As the region picks up operating costs, cities could build other transportation investments with their general fund revenues and dedicated taxes. Mr. Anderson stated that staff direction would include Mr. Billings's farebox question.

Mayor Hawker suggested working with RPTA because the two percent goes away.

Chairman Giuliano asked Mr. Anderson if he needed further direction. Mr. Anderson stated that direction included regional facilities' costs, maintenance lots, park and ride, and the Tempe Town Bridge.

Mr. Gant asked for clarification of Grand Avenue being included in the freeway plan instead of the arterial portion. Mr. Anderson replied that Grand Avenue is an ADOT project, and it was more convenient to group the ADOT system projects together.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the TPC had made great progress. He commented that members should feel free to call or write comments. Chairman Giuliano stated that the comments are due on the hybrid plan June 23rd.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the next steps: Staff review of comments received from Maricopa County, and ADOT's comments are anticipated by June 23rd. He proposed that a fiscally balanced hybrid could be discussed at the workshop on July 2nd. In addition, there is a regular meeting on July 16th from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., and an additional meeting on July 22 at 2:00 p.m., if needed.

Mayor Hawker asked for clarification if direction to staff included the 20-mile light rail starter segment with maintenance and operations separately. Mr. Anderson stated that regional funding for the 20-mile starter segment was not being contemplated, just the regional facilities that serve the system. Valley Metro Rail has a policy on pick up of the pro rata share. He stated that the idea is that the region would pick up the cost of the facilities on the front end.

Mayor Hawker asked if the assumption was 100 percent of express bus capital costs. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. Mayor Hawker asked if costs beyond the 20-mile light rail starter segment would be regionally funded. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. If the region picks up the cost of the facilities, all participating cities would benefit. He added that funding for regional light rail operations and maintenance was not being considered. Mayor Hawker commented that he thought a decision for funding light rail maintenance had not yet been made.

7. Update from the Maintenance Stakeholders Group

This agenda item was not considered.

At the April 16, 2003 TPC meeting, members were requested to volunteer to serve on a Maintenance Stakeholders Group. The purpose of the group is to develop a mechanism to provide adequate resources to the Arizona Department of Transportation for maintenance purposes in the Maricopa region. This would include such issues as litter pick up, freeway sweeping and landscape maintenance. The Maintenance Stakeholders Group has met twice and an update will be provided on options for highway maintenance funding in the region.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who stated that at the stakeholders maintenance meeting, there was a problem with the new map that will double the freeway maintenance. He stated his agreement with Supervisor Stapley that the State needs to add two cents to the gas tax to bring the maintenance level where it should be. Mr. Crowley stated that bus service is needed to Wickenburg. He stated this is not a regional plan if it does not include all of Maricopa County. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

8. Regional Transportation Plan Video

As part of the MAG public involvement effort, a video has been produced that will be broadcast on local access channels. The video will provide information to citizens on the Regional Transportation Plan.

Chairman Giuliano instructed staff to provide the Regional Transportation Plan video to members to run on cable access channels.

Chairman Giuliano recognized public comment from Bill Gemmell, who serves on the START Committee, which provided Mayor Thomas with bus funding, and also serves on the Estrella Village Committee for the City of Phoenix. He stated that their comment is where is the commuter rail portion? Mr. Gemmell stated his agreement with Mr. Arnett. He stated that the MAG High Capacity Transit Study showed the Buckeye to Phoenix line to be commuter rail, and this is the same corridor as the I-10 reliever. At a cost of \$500 million, why not use the corridor for commuter rail instead of spending money on a freeway? Mr. Gemmell stated that he recently met with Union Pacific and they have indicated they are willing to talk. To qualify for new start funds, a project needs to be a part of the Regional Transportation Plan. Chairman Giuliano thanked Mr. Gemmell for his comments.

9. Future Agenda Items

At the July 2, 2003 TPC Workshop, we anticipate discussing the following items:

- Alternatives Stage Results

- Final Draft Stage of the Plan

At the July 16, 2003 TPC meeting, we anticipate discussing the following items:

- Potential Approval of Final Draft Stage of the Plan

Chairman Giuliano stated that as chairman, he received correspondence from Southwest Gas, which he would hand over to staff to follow up with Valley Metro. The correspondence was in regard to gas lines that would lie underneath future infrastructure. There are concerns about how the heat generated could affect the gas lines. Mr. Shultz commented that meetings have already begun on this issue.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary